

REMARKS

Restrictions in the Office Action

The Office Action of September 6, 2006, interpreted the application as containing claims directed to the following patenably distinct inventions:

I: Claims 1-10, 28-33;

II: Claims 11-16 and 34-38;

III: Claims 17-25; and

IV: Claims 26-27.

Response to Restriction Requirement

Applicant respectfully elections Group I (claims 1~10, 28-33), with traverse. Applicant has amended certain claims, and these amendments (at least to some extent) nullify the restriction requirement. Applicant traverses the restriction requirement because it is believed that the examination of all claims can be made without under burden on the examiner.

In this regard, the MPEP requires that no such election or restriction be required, when the application can be searched and examined without undue burden on the Examiner. Further, Applicant understands that, if the Examiner maintains the restriction, that the Examiner acknowledges that any prior art used to reject the elected group will not be used to reject claims of other groups in any ensuing divisional application, because any such rejection would be tantamount to an admission that the examination of those claims could proceed with the current claims, with no undue burden to the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that election/restriction requirement has been satisfied without traverse. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500